UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/369,490	08/05/1999	ERIC O. BODNAR	SF/0027.01	6852

22470 7590 05/05/2006

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER	
ZIA, SYED	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2131	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/369,490
Filing Date: August 05, 1999
Appellant(s): BODNAR, ERIC O.

Ernest J. Beffel, Jr.
Reg. No. 43,489
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed February 17, 2006 appealing from the Final Office action mailed September 19, 2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

This appeal involves claims 89-106.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

A copy of the appealed claims 89-106 appears on pages in the Appendix to the appellant's brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,408,326 LARSSON et al. 06-2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 89-93, 96-102, and 105-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Butler et al. (U. S. Patent 6,771,743).

3. Regarding claim 89, Butler teach and describe a method to schedule a method of sending messages (data communication network 3) from a web server to a parent application (voice processing system 2) running on a client machine (Fig.1), the parent application having an embedded browser that communicates with the web server (col.5line 17 line 23), the method including:

the parent application intercepting a web page sent from the web server to the embedded browser (col.5 line 33 to line 37), the web page including one or more special key tags encoded with instructions to the parent application (col.5 line 23 to line 30), wherein the special key tags

[i.e. VRU tags] are not HTML formatting tags (col.3 line 48 to line 53, and col.6 line 10 to line 18);

the parent application responding to the encoded instructions by triggering a special behavior [i.e. VRU tags actions] of the parent application, distinct from displaying the [i.e. HTML document] web page (col.5 line 23 to line 32, and col.6 line 9 to line 20); and

the embedded browser displaying at least part of the web page other than the special key tags (col.6 line 3 to line 8).

4. Regarding claim 98, Butler teach and describe a method to schedule a method of sending parent application (voice processing system 2) adapted [i.e. embedding special tags] to receive messages (data communication network 3) from a web server by intercepting them [i.e. voice processing system of reading Web page tags], the parent application including:

an embedded browser, embedded in the parent application; and computer-implemented logic adapted to (col.5line 17 line 33):

intercept a web page from the web server addressed to the embedded browser (col.5 line 33 to line 37), the web page including one or more special key tags encoded with instructions to the parent application (col.5 line 23 to line 30), wherein the special key tags [i.e. VRU tags] are not HTML formatting tags (col.3 line 48 to line 53, and col.6 line 10 to line 18);

trigger special behavior [i.e. VRU tags dependent actions] of the parent application in response to the encoded instructions, distinct from displaying the web page [i.e. HTML document] (col.5 line 23 to line 32, and col.6 line 9 to line 20); and

pass to the embedded browser at least part of the intercepted web page for the embedded browser to display (col.6 line 3 to line 8).

5. Claims 90-93, 96-97 are rejected applied as above rejecting Claim 89. Furthermore, Butler teach and describe embedding context sensitive Web portal in an application (Fig.1-2): further including

As to Claim 90, the parent application removing the special key tags from the web page and passing the revised web page to the embedded browser for display (col.6 line 14 to line 37).

As to Claim 91, as the special behavior of the parent application, running code accessible to the client machine as instructed by the special key tags [i.e. VRU tags], wherein the code is not part of the embedded browser and not downloaded with the web page (col.3 line 48 to line 60, and col. 6 line 38 to line 47).

As to Claim 92, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue [i.e. retrieving info after making selection on displayed Web page, such as press option "1"] to configure the parent application (col. 6 line 38 to line 45).

As to Claim 93, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue to configure [i.e. retrieving info after making selection on displayed Web page, such as press option "1"] the parent application (col. 6 line 38 to line 45).

As to Claim 96, the special behavior of the parent application [i.e. such as voice processing], customizing the web page with user-specific information accessible to the parent application and not provided in the intercepted web page [i.e. using Dialed Number

Identification Service by voice processing system to access data corresponding to user-specific information] (col.5 line 9 to line 23)

As to Claim 97, the special behavior of the parent application, invoking a handler routine [i.e. such as signal processing routine] responsive to instructions in auxiliary information that is part of the special key tags (col.5 line 33 to line 44).

6. Claims 99-103, and 105-106 are rejected applied as above rejecting Claim 98. Furthermore, Butler teach and describe embedding context sensitive Web portal in an application (Fig.1-2) further including:

As to Claim 99, the parent application removing the special key tags from the web page and passing the revised web page to the browser for display (col.6 line 14 to line 37).

As to Claim 100, as the special behavior of the parent application, running code accessible to the client machine as instructed by the special key tags [i.e. VRU tags], wherein the code is not part of the embedded browser and not downloaded with the web page (col.3 line 48 to line 60, and col. 6 line 38 to line 47).

As to Claim 101, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue to configure the parent application [i.e. retrieving info after making selection on displayed Web page, such as press option "1"] to configure the parent application (col.6 line 38 to line 45).

As to Claim 102, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue to configure the parent application [i.e. retrieving info after making selection on

displayed Web page, such as press option "1"] to configure the parent application (col.6 line 38 to line 45).

As to Claim 105, the special behavior of the parent application [i.e. such as voice processing], customizing the web page with user specific information accessible to the parent application and not provided in the intercepted web page [i.e. using Dialed Number Identification Service by voice processing system to access data corresponding to user-specific information] (col.5 line 9 to line 23).

As to Claim 106, the special behavior of the parent application, invoking a handler routine [i.e. such as signal processing routine] responsive to instructions in auxiliary information that is part of the special key tags (col.5 line 33 to line 44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 94-95, and 103-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butler et al. (U. S. Patent 6,771,743) as applied to claim 89, and 98 above, and further in view of Larson et al. (U. S. Patent 6,408,326).

Regarding Claim 94-95, and 103-104 Butler teach and describe embedding context sensitive Web portal in an application, such as voice processing system with special tags (Fig.1-2, and abstract)

Although the system and method disclosed by Butler shows all the features of the claimed limitation, such as special behavior of the parent application (col.6 line 38 to line 45) but Butler does not specifically disclose modifying a name/value pair of system registry entry corresponding to the parent application.

In an analogous art, Larson, on the other hand discloses computing environment that relates to system and method to administer network environment for application programs that can write registry parameters in a binary name/value pair format (Larson: Abstract).

- modifying a system registry entry corresponding to the parent application, and the system registry entry includes at least one name/value pair (Larson: Abstract, col.1 line 15 to line 52).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Butler and Larson, because Larson's method of building system registry for applications using name/value pair would not only provide an extensible and portable mechanism for parent application (such as voice processing system) for applying parent application control regarding each user in a predetermined format (such as name/value pair format), but will also provide uniform mechanism of updating, and enforcing a particular control (policy) value and configuration for applications (parent application) for each user using the (parent) application..

(10) Response to Argument

A: Butler References

1: The Appellant has indicated that "Butlers voice processing server works with ordinary telephones (i.e. plain-old-telephones POTs) - *not the new-fangled vision cell phones that run browsers*" (emphasis added).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The Appellant argues limitations that which are not claimed, in response to Appellant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. *new-fangled vision cell phones that run browsers*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Examiner would also like to point out that Butler teaches a voice processing system, method and computer program product which allows the caller (i.e. a *client* as claimed in Claim 1) to access Internet World Wide Web pages (Summary, and Fig1-2).

B.

1: As per claim 89:

It is argued by the Appellant that in Butler " i) *caller does not use an application program with an embedded browser, where both the parent and embedded browser*

processing parts of the same web pages", and " ii) *the ordinary telephone does not see the web page and really has no idea whether the recording really corresponds to the web page*"

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Regarding first argument, Butler teaches of a processing of voice application tags as well as HTML tags in Web pages. In the system of Butler, a typical web page is created by adding some voice application commands (special tags) with HTML tags (regular tags). A voice application (parent application) ignores all HTML-tag information written for a graphical embedded Web browser and a graphical Web browser ignores all HTML-tag information written for the voice application. This way, the same HTML Web page is presented to both (first to a voice application then embedded browser) and processed in parts based on the recognized vocabulary of tags (i.e. regular HTML tags or special tags, such as voice application tags) as they encountered during the parsing of Web HTML page (col.2line 43 to line 54).

Regarding second argument, Butler explicitly describes a voice application on the fly is formed on a voice processing system by interpreting the web page containing HTML information and voice processing system commands. This web page is the same web page that the caller requested initially by dialing a specific telephone number recognized and guaranteed by the voice processing system running on the server (col.5 line 9 to line 43).

Appellant further argued that "the crux of the difference between Applicant and the Examiner might lie in the Examiner's misplaced argument (FOA 3:9-10) that Butler's system allows the same HTML document to be accessible to both computer users via graphical Web browser and to telephone callers via a voice browser. While this argument has a sound

premise, the fact that the same page can be displayed differently to two users (one on a phone and another on a computer) does not matter, because that is not what is claimed. In claim 89, the same web page is processed by the parent application for its special keys and then at least part of the same web page is processed by the embedded browser and visually displayed to the user".

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The appellant argues limitations that which are not claimed, in response to Appellant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. visually displayed to the user) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
Examiner would also like to point out that Butler teaches a Web client-server computer system and provides a method for embedding a context-sensitive Web portal in a parent application operating on the Web client. The parent application (voice processing system 2) is adapted [i.e. embedding special tags with regular HTM tags] to receive messages from a web server (data communication network 3) by intercepting messages [i.e. voice processing system reading Web page special tags]. In response to a user request, the application traps the request before the embedded browser processes the request by implementing logic adapted to (col.5line 17 line 33) intercept a web page from the web server addressed to the embedded browser (col.5 line 33 to line 37). The web page may include one or more special key tags encoded with instructions for the parent application (col.5 line 23 to line 30). The parent application may determine whether the web pages contain a special key tag. If the web page does comprise a special key tags [i.e. VRU tags] which are not HTML formatting tags (col.3 line 48 to line 53, and col.6 line 10 to line

18) then parent application trigger special behavior [i.e. VRU tags dependent actions] in response to the encoded instructions, distinct from displaying the web page [i.e. HTML document] (col.5 line 23 to line 32, and col.6 line 9 to line 20). The parent application then passes to the embedded browser at least part of the intercepted web page information, not processed by the parent application, to the client device (col.6 line 3 to line 8).

For these reasons, it is believed that the teachings of Butler anticipates the applicant's language of claim 89.

2: As per claim 98:

It is argued by the Appellant that in Butler " i) *caller does not use an application program with an embedded browser, where both the parent and embedded browser processing parts of the same web pages*", and " ii) *the ordinary telephone does not see the web page and really has no idea whether the recording really corresponds to the web page*"

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Regarding first argument, Butler teaches of a processing of voice application tags as well as HTML tags in Web pages. In the system of Butler, a typical web page is created by adding some voice application commands (special tags) with HTML tags (regular tags). A voice application (parent application) ignores all HTML-tag information written for a graphical embedded Web browser and a graphical Web browser ignores all HTML-tag information written for the voice application. This way, the same HTML Web page is presented to both (first to a voice application then embedded browser) and processed in parts based on the recognized vocabulary of tags (i.e. regular HTML tags or special

tags, such as voice application tags) as they encountered during the parsing of Web HTML page (col.2line 43 to line 54).

Regarding second argument, Butler explicitly describes a voice application on the fly is formed on a voice processing system by interpreting the web page containing HTML information and voice processing system commands. This web page is the same web page that the caller requested initially by dialing a specific telephone number recognized and guaranteed by the voice processing system running on the server (col.5 line 9 to line 43).

Appellant further argued that "the crux of the difference between Applicant and the Examiner might lie in the Examiner's misplaced argument (FOA 3:9-10) that Butler's system allows the same HTML document to be accessible to both computer users via graphical Web browser and to telephone callers via a voice browser. While this argument has a sound premise, the fact that the same page can be displayed differently to two users (one on a phone and another on a computer) does not matter, because that is not what is claimed. In claim 89, the same web page is processed by the parent application for its special keys and then at least part of the same web page is processed by the embedded browser and visually displayed to the user".

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The appellant argues limitations that which are not claimed, in response to Appellant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e. visually displayed to the user) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Examiner would also like to point out that Butler teaches a Web client-server computer system and provides a method for embedding a context-sensitive Web portal in a parent application operating on the Web client. The parent application (voice processing system 2) is adapted [i.e. embedding special tags with regular HTM tags] to receive messages from a web server (data communication network 3) by intercepting messages [i.e. voice processing system reading Web page special tags]. In response to a user request, the application traps the request before the embedded browser processes the request by implementing logic adapted to (col.5line 17 line 33) intercept a web page from the web server addressed to the embedded browser (col.5 line 33 to line 37). The web page may include one or more special key tags encoded with instructions for the parent application (col.5 line 23 to line 30). The parent application may determine whether the web pages contain a special key tag. If the web page does comprise a special key tags [i.e. VRU tags] which are not HTML formatting tags (col.3 line 48 to line 53, and col.6 line 10 to line 18) then parent application trigger special behavior [i.e. VRU tags dependent actions] in response to the encoded instructions, distinct from displaying the web page [i.e. HTML document] (col.5 line 23 to line 32, and col.6 line 9 to line 20). The parent application then passes to the embedded browser at least part of the intercepted web page information, which were not processed by the parent application, to the client device (col.6 line 3 to line 8).

For these reasons, it is believed that the teachings of Butler anticipates the applicant's language of claim 98.

3. As per Claim 90, and 99, Appellant argues that Butler further "fails to disclose and does not teach the parent application removing audible rendering tags from the HTML page and passing the rest of the page to an embedded browser for display".

The examiner respectfully disagrees, the examiner would like to point out that the Appellant avoids defining the terminology "removing audible rendering tags" for the record, but only asserts that it is not taught by Butler. The examiner could not locate the language of "removing audible rendering tags" from the Appellant's specification, but rather interprets "removing audible rendering tags" to be defined as "special key tags" in view of the Appellant's specification. To the extent of the claim language, "removing audible rendering tags" is defined as storing on the "special key tags". Butler teaches of a parent application may determine whether the web pages contain a special key tag. If the web page does comprise a special key tags [i.e. VRU tags] which are not HTML formatting tags (col.3 line 48 to line 53, and col.6 line 10 to line 18) then parent application trigger special behavior [i.e. VRU tags dependent actions] in response to the encoded instructions, distinct from displaying the web page [i.e. HTML document] (col.5 line 23 to line 32, and col.6 line 9 to line 20). The parent application then passes to the embedded browser at least part of the intercepted web page information, which were not processed by the parent application, to the client device (col.6 line 3 to line 8).

For these reasons, it is believed that the teachings of Butler anticipates the applicant's language of claims 90, and 99.

4. As per Claim 92, and 101, Appellant argues that Butler does not

teach presenting a set-up dialog to configure the parent application, responsive lo a special key tag.

The examiner disagrees with the Appellant's assertion. Butler teaches of a retrieving information after making selection from the received Web page dialogue (in voice format), such as press option "1", and further configuring parent application's selection criteria for retrieving the desired request from the world wide web (col. 6 line 38 to line 45).

For these reasons, it is believed that the teachings of Butler anticipates the applicant's language of claims 92, and 101.

5. As per Claim 97, and 106, Appellant argues that the" passage (Butler 5:33-44) relied on does not teach invoking a handler routine before passing the remainder of the web page to an embedded browser to display".

The examiner respectfully disagrees, the Appellant argues limitations that which are not claimed, in response to Appellant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the remainder of the web page) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989). See also Celeritas Technologies Ltd. v. Rockwell International Corp., 150 F.3d 1354, 1361, 47

USPQ2d 1516, 1522-23 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Butler teach of a Web client-server computer system and provides a method for embedding a context-sensitive Web portal in a parent application operating on the Web client. The parent application (voice processing system 2) is adapted [i.e. embedding special tags with regular HTM tags] to receive messages from a web server (data communication network 3) by intercepting messages [i.e. voice processing system reading Web page special tags]. In response to a user request, the application traps the request before the embedded browser processes the request by implementing logic adapted to (col.5line 17 line 33) intercept a web page from the web server addressed to the embedded browser (col.5 line 33 to line 37).

For these reasons, it is believed that the teachings of Butler anticipates the applicant's language of claims 97, and 106.

C: Regarding 91, 93, 96, 100, 102, and 105, Appellant did not file specific argument, and rely on the argument submitted for independent claims. Appellant mentioned that these dependent claims should be allowable because at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims.

The examiner disagrees with the Appellant's assertion. Butler teaches all the limitation of claims 89, and 98. Therefore, for these reasons set forth above rejecting claims 89, and 98, it is believed that the teachings of Butler anticipates the applicant's language of claims 91, 93, 96, 100, 102, and 105.

D: Rejection of Dependent Claims Regarding 94-95, and 103-104 Under 35 U.S.C 103 (a)

Regarding Claims 94-95, and 103-104 appellant argued that the applicant did not find "*in Butler or Larson any suggestion or teaching to modify a voice processor to enforce system administrator policies for users at login*" and "*motivation ignores how the voice processor works*". Appellant further argued that "Butler with Larson would change the principle of operation of Butler and would render Butler unsatisfactory for its intended purpose".

The examiner respectfully disagrees. It is the examiner's opinion that Appellant is arguing bodily incorporation of references. Appellant is respectively reminded that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. *See In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Appellant further argues that Butler and Larson are in analogous art, because Butler "parent application" is applying is a voice processor program that responds to user requests to browse a web page without requiring a user login, while the Larson reference provides a tool that allows a system administrator controlling a login server to set policies that are implemented when users login to individual machines using the login server.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner notes that the portions that Appellant has taken have never been addressed by the examiner. Specifically, the examiner relies mostly on the web communication of Butler. The examiner asserts that Butler teach and describe

embedding context sensitive Web portal in an application, such as voice processing system with special tags (Fig.1-2, and abstract), and Butler also shows specific features of the claimed limitation, such as special behavior of the parent application, when encounter special tags (col.6 line 38 to line 45). In this method, Butler teach an authentication process where when the caller first calls-in to the voice processing system, the specific telephone number dialed by the caller is recognized by the voice processing system (step 21) according to a well-known technique known as Dialed Number Identification Service (DNIS). The recognized DNIS data is then used by the voice processing system (step 22) to access data corresponding to that telephone number. In the preferred embodiment a specific dialed phone number is recognized and used by the voice processing system 2 to retrieve a corresponding Web home page (initial Web page for first presenting to the caller) from the Internet. This Web home page is accessed by the voice processing system 2 from the data communications network 3 via line 13 of FIG. 1 (col.5 line 9 to line 23).

Larson, on the other hand discloses computing environment that relates to system and method to administer network environment, such as authenticating a user, for application programs [parent application, i.e. voice processing system 2] that can write registry parameters in a binary name/value pair format (Larson: Abstract). Therefore, both Butler and Larson are analogous art because both of them are related to authenticating the user in a network environment to access application software.

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Butler and Larson, because Larson's method of building system registry for applications using name/value pair would not only provide an

extensible and portable mechanism in Butler for parent application (such as voice processing system) for applying parent application control regarding each user in a predetermined format (such as name/value pair format), but will also provide uniform mechanism of updating, and enforcing a particular control (policy) value and configuration for applications (parent application) for each user using the (parent) application (Larson: col. 1 line 43 to line 58).

For these reasons, it is believed that the teachings of system of Butler and Larsson teaches the applicant's language of claims 94-95, and 103-104.

(11) Related Proceedings Appendix

No decision rendered by a court of the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Syed A. Zia (Examiner AU 2131)

Conferees:

Matthew Smithers (Primary Examiner AU 2137)

Gilberto Barron Jr. (SPE AU 2132)

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1– 88. (Cancelled)

89. (Previously presented) A method of sending messages from a web server to a parent application running on a client machine, the parent application having an embedded browser that communicates with the web server, the method including:

the parent application intercepting a web page sent from the web server to the embedded browser, the web page including one or more special key tags encoded with instructions to the parent application, wherein the special key tags are not HTML formatting tags;

the parent application responding to the encoded instructions by triggering a special behavior of the parent application, distinct from displaying the web page; and

the embedded browser displaying at least part of the web page other than the special key tags.

90. (Previously presented) The method of claim 89, further including the parent application removing the special key tags from the web page and passing the revised web page to the embedded browser for display.

91. (Previously presented) The method of claim 89, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, running code accessible to the client machine as instructed by the special key tags, wherein the code is not part of the embedded browser and not downloaded with the web page.

92. (Previously presented) The method of claim 89, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue to configure the parent application.

93. (Previously presented) The method of claim 91, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue to configure the parent application.

94. (Previously presented) The method of claim 89, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, modifying a system registry entry corresponding to the parent application.

95. (Previously presented) The method of claim 94, wherein the system registry entry includes at least one name/value pair.

96. (Previously presented) The method of claim 89, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, customizing the web page with user-specific information accessible to the parent application and not provided in the intercepted web page.

97. (Previously presented) The method of claim 89, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, invoking a handler routine responsive to instructions in auxiliary information that is part of the special key tags.

98. (Previously presented) A parent application adapted to receive messages from a web server by intercepting them, the parent application including:
an embedded browser, embedded in the parent application; and
computer-implemented logic adapted to:

intercept a web page from the web server addressed to the embedded browser, the web page including one or more special key tags encoded with instructions to the parent application, wherein the special key tags are not HTML formatting tags;

trigger special behavior of the parent application in response to the encoded instructions, distinct from displaying the web page; and

pass to the embedded browser at least part of the intercepted web page for the embedded browser to display.

99. (Previously presented) The method of claim 98, further including the parent application removing the special key tags from the web page and passing the revised web page to the browser for display.

100. (Previously presented) The method of claim 98, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, running code accessible to the client machine as instructed by the special key tags, wherein the code is not part of the embedded browser and not downloaded with the web page.

101. (Previously presented) The method of claim 99, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue to configure the parent application.

102. (Previously presented) The method of claim 98, further including, as the

special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue to configure the parent application.

103. (Previously presented) The method of claim 98, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, modifying a system registry entry corresponding to the parent application.

104. (Previously presented) The method of claim 103, wherein the system registry entry includes at least one name/value pair.

105. (Previously presented) The method of claim 98, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, customizing the web page with user-specific information accessible to the parent application and not provided in the intercepted web page.

106. (Previously presented) The method of claim 98, further including, as the special behavior of the parent application, invoking a handler routine responsive to instructions in auxiliary information that is part of the special key tags.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

Appellants have no evidence to submit under Rules 130 or 132.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

As there are no related proceedings, there is nothing to submit in this appendix.